THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 13861 of 2005

-

Date: 01.08.2005

Between:

K. Sudarshana Rao, Manager and Corespondent,

Good Shepherd Residential Elementary and High Schools,

Vanapalle gudem, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Secretary, Government of Andhra Pradesh,

   Education Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 13861 of 2005

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the inaction of the second respondent in disposing of his representation dated 02.05.2005 to recognize him as the Correspondent of GSR High School, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District, as

illegal, arbitrary and without jurisdiction.

2. It is stated that the petitioner started Good Shepherd Residential Elementary School in the year 1970 at Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District with his own funds. Subsequently, it was upgraded as 'Upper Primary School' in the year 1977. The School was recognized by the first respondent and admitted into grant-in-aid. It was further upgraded as 'High School' in the year 1994. Both the Primary School as well as the High School have been running separately in separate buildings. The petitioner, being the founder of the Schools, was acting as a Manager and Correspondent of the Schools. But, however, by creating some false documents, one AE Mission, Eluru/AE Mission, Andhra Pradesh, has recommended for change of Correspondentship of the petitioner by appointing one K.Prabhakara Rao and the said K.Prabhakara Rao, obtained orders from the second respondent as Correspondent of the above High School. Similarly, the fourth respondent also obtained orders from the second respondent as the Correspondent of the School behind the back of the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner made a representation to the second respondent on 02.05.2005 giving all the details and to recognize him as the Correspondent of Good Shepherd Residential High School, Tadepalligudem. Though the said representation was received by the second respondent on 09.05.2005, no action has been taken by him. Therefore, the petitioner has come up with the present writ petition.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Education.

4. As the representation of the petitioner dated 02.05.2005 was not disposed of by the second respondent, it is appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the second respondent to pass appropriate orders on the representation of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of at the admission stage.

_____

S. Ananda Reddy, J

Date: 01.08.2005

va